

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, and 4 through 37 are in the application, with claims 1, 4, 6, 8, 10, 11, 15, 20, 22, 24, 27, 29, 30, 32, 34, 36, and 37 having been amended and claim 3 having been cancelled. Claims 1, 10, 15, 24, 29, and 34 are the independent claims herein. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration and entry of this amendment are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections

Claims 6, 20, 27, 32, and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 second paragraph. Claims 1-7, 10, 13-21, and 24-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0004853 (“Ram”). Claims 8-9, 11-12, and 22-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Ram in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,876,981 (“Berckmans”). Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

§112 Rejections

Claims 6, 20, 27, 32, and 37 have been amended in response to the Examiner’s helpful suggestion. Withdrawal of the section 112 rejections is respectfully requested.

§102 Rejections

Claims 1, 10, 15, 24, 29, and 34

Amended independent claim 1 relates to a user interface. The interface comprises at least one option quote area presenting a plurality of option quotes and an order entry area comprising input areas for inputting two or more option orders. When one of the presented plurality of option quotes is selected, appropriate input areas of the order entry area are populated with an option order corresponding to the selected option quote.

The art of record cannot be seen to disclose or suggest the above-mentioned features of amended independent claim 1. In particular, the art of record cannot be seen to disclose that

when one of a presented plurality of option quotes is selected, appropriate input areas of an order entry area are populated with an option order corresponding to the selected option quote.

The Office Action, on page 3, states that Ram at paragraphs [0042] and [0043] discloses “presenting details of an option order corresponding to the selected option quote in appropriate input areas of the order entry area”. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Ram, at FIG. 12, displays a plurality of tab sets 124/120/126/128 etc. Tab sets 120 and 124 display securities data and tab set 128 includes a buy button, a sell button and a short button for buying, selling, or shorting securities. At paragraphs [0042] and [0043] Ram discloses that a display at a trader’s location will display data for a selected security and, as illustrated in FIG. 12, the displayed data will be displayed in a tab set such as tab set 120 or tab set 124. However, nowhere do the aforementioned paragraphs disclose that by selecting a security in a first tab set (such as tab sets 120 or 124) will data be populated in a tab set that facilitates the ordering of securities, such as tab set 128. Thus, while the above-mentioned paragraphs disclose displaying a plurality of data, the paragraphs do not disclose populating data in an appropriate input area of an order entry area.

Therefore, nowhere can Ram be seen to disclose or suggest that when one of a presented plurality of option quotes is selected, appropriate input areas of an order entry area are populated with an option order corresponding to the selected option quote.

Accordingly, amended independent claim 1 and its related dependent claims are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Amended independent claims 10, 15, 24, 29, and 34 recite similar limitations as amended independent claim 1. Therefore, amended independent claims 10, 15, 24, 29, and 34 and their related dependent claims are believed to be in condition for allowance.

§103 Rejections

Claim 8

Dependent claim 8 discloses the user interface of Claim 1 where a presented option quote is associated with one of a plurality of brightness levels of a color. A level of brightness is determined based on a difference between a strike price of the presented option quote and a price of a security underlying the presented option quote.

The Office Action states “Ram discloses using color indicators for differentiating types of order data”. Ram, at paragraphs [0060] and [0235] disclose that “a specific color may be assigned” or that a color may be used to “represent a short order” and “another color used to represent an option”. However, nowhere does Ram or Berckmans disclose determining a level of brightness based on a difference between a strike price of the presented option quote and a price of a security underlying the presented option quote. Therefore, in view of the foregoing, dependent claim 8 is believed to be in condition for allowance.

C O N C L U S I O N

The outstanding Office Action presents a number of characterizations regarding each of the applied references, some of which are not directly addressed herein because they are not related to the rejections of the independent claims. Applicant does not necessarily agree with the characterizations and reserve the right to further discuss those characterizations.

For at least the reasons given above, it is submitted that the entire application is in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience. Alternatively, if there remains any question regarding the present application or any of the cited references, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions for expediting allowance of the present application, the Examiner is cordially requested to contact the undersigned via telephone at (203) 972-4982.

Respectfully submitted,

January 18, 2008
Date

/Richard S. Finkelstein/
Richard S. Finkelstein
Registration No. 56,534
Buckley, Maschoff & Talwalkar LLC
50 Locust Avenue
New Canaan, CT 06840
(203) 972-0049